

10-31-05

17:01

FROM-Praxair, Inc.

+2038372515

T-946 P.004/005 F-219

U.S. Serial No. 10/670,460  
21,294

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 31 2005

- 1 -

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of

Facey et al

Group Art Unit: 1725

Application No.: 10/670,460

Filed: September 26, 2003

Title: METHOD FOR CENTERING A  
SPUTTER TARGET ONTO A  
BACKING PLATE AND THE  
ASSEMBLY THEREOF

Examiner: J. Johnson

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Via Fax – (571) 273-8300  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In complete response to the Official Action issued August 9, 2005, Applicants respectfully elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I drawn to a method of making a sputter target assembly. Attached hereto is an extension of time for a period of two-months.

M.P.E.P. §803 states that an application may be properly restricted to one or more claimed inventions only if (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Thus, even if appropriate reasons exist for requiring restriction, such a requirement should not be made unless there is an undue burden on the Examiner to examine all the claims in a single application.

Although the Examiner has alleged different classifications for the inventions for Groups I and II, it would seem that search and examination involved for both groups of invention would substantially overlap. For example, the elected sputter target assemblies, involve the alignment of the target to the backing plate. It would seem that some overlap would exist with examination of the method of forming the sputter targets of the non-elected invention. Because of

10-31-05

17:01

FROM-Praxair, Inc.

+2038372515

T-946 P.005/005 F-219

U.S. Serial No. 10/670,460  
21,294

- 2 -

the apparent overlapping examination, a serious burden would not be imposed on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in a single application, and restriction is improper. With respect to the election of species, Applicants select subgroup Ib. However, it is noted that the dependent claims identified further define or adds features to the ones found in the independent claims. Further, as the Examiner has noted claims 1 and 13 are generic. Thus, all the dependent claims should be examined together.

If there are any questions concerning this paper, or the application in general, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his or her earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Iurie A. Schwartz  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 43,909

Danbury, Connecticut 06810  
(203) 837-2115  
October 31, 2005  
CS-21,294

**CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300 on October 31, 2005.

Typed or printed name of person signing this certificate  
CHRISTINA Mommens

Signature: 